



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,536	10/31/2001	Pradeep Sindhu	1014-014US01	4412

28863 7590 02/21/2006
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P. A.
8425 SEASONS PARKWAY
SUITE 105
ST. PAUL, MN 55125

EXAMINER

AVELLINO, JOSEPH E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>10/004,536</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>SINDHU ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Joseph E. Avellino <i>A</i></p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2143</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,11-32,34 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9,11-32,34 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9, 11-33, and 34-35 are presented for examination; claims 1, 9, 18, 24, 30, and 35 independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-9, 11-33, 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathur (USPN 6,424,658) in view of Muller et al. (USPN 6,246,680) (hereinafter Muller)

3. Referring to independent claim 1, Mathur discloses a routing component 22, 24 comprising:

a first interface (i.e. network interface) to communicate with a first network interface (Figure 3, ref. 32, 34);

a second interface (i.e. data bus 42, which is well known to have a higher bandwidth than a WAN interface) to communicate with a second network interface having a bandwidth higher than a bandwidth of the first network interface, wherein the first interface and the second interface are integrated within a single integrated circuit (i.e. network switch chip) (Figure 3, ref. 36, 38; col. 3, lines 55-60); and

Art Unit: 2143

an embedded memory (i.e. FIFO) within the integrated circuit (Figure 3, ref. 32, 34);

at least one control unit that determines a direction of communication for the data between the first and second interfaces (i.e. depending on which interface the packet is received upon, this determines the direction of communication, a packet received on the first interface cannot come from the second interface) (col. 6, lines 3-15).

Mathur does not specifically disclose a memory interface to couple the integrated circuit to an external memory for buffering data communicated in a second direction from the second interface having a higher bandwidth to the first interface having a lower bandwidth. In analogous art, Muller discloses another routing component which includes a memory interface 220 to couple the element to an external memory for buffering data communicated from the second interface to the first interface (col. 4, line 61 to col. 5, line 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Muller with Mathur to provide a buffered architecture to Mathur to provide temporary storage for efficient allocation of per port buffering that is proportional to the amount of traffic through a given port as supported by Muller (col. 8, lines 35-40).

4. Referring to claim 2, Mathur discloses a first control unit to buffer in the embedded memory data that is received from the first interface and forwarded to the second interface (e.g. abstract). Mathur does not disclose a second control unit to buffer in the external memory data that is received from the second interface and

Art Unit: 2143

forwarding to the first interface. In analogous art, Muller discloses another routing component which includes a second control unit 220 to buffer in the external memory data that is received from the second interface and forwarding to the first interface (col. 7, line 35 to col. 8, line 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Muller with Mathur to provide a buffered architecture to Mathur to provide temporary storage for efficient allocation of per port buffering that is proportional to the amount of traffic through a given port as supported by Muller (col. 8, lines 35-40).

5. Referring to claim 3, Mathur in view of Muller disclose the system substantively as described in claim 2. Mathur in view of Muller do not specifically disclose the external memory has a greater storage capacity than the embedded memory, however it is well known that external memory (i.e. hard drives, flash drives, etc.) can have a higher storage capacity than embedded memory such as registers and Random Access Memory. Therefore it would have been obvious to assume the external memory would have a greater storage capacity than the embedded memory since it would allow for more packets to be stored and thereby reducing page faults in the external device.

6. Referring to claim 4, Mathur discloses the first interface comprises a WAN (i.e. network) interface (col. 6, lines 3-15).

Art Unit: 2143

7. Referring to claim 5, Mathur discloses the second interface comprises a switch fabric interface (i.e. token ring) (Figure 3, ref. 30, 42).

8. Referring to claim 6, Mathur discloses the switch fabric interface communicates crossbar data (i.e. data transmitted between routing components (co. 7, lines 10-25).

9. Referring to claim 7, Mathur discloses the routing component is implemented using an ASIC (it is understood in the art and in the specification as defined on page 4, an ASIC is a circuit board or chip which is designed for a particular function, in this case the routing component 12 is integrated on a single switch chip, therefore it is implemented as an Application Specific IC, the Application in this case is to provide routing function) (Figure 2; col. 3, lines 55-60).

10. Referring to claim 8, Mathur discloses the embedded memory comprises a RAM (i.e. DRAM) (Figure 2, ref. 20).

11. Claims 9, 11-33, and 34-35 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above. Furthermore Mathur discloses comprising a second router having an embedded memory to store data communicated using the second network interface (col. 6, lines 3-10).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed December 15, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

13. In the remarks, Applicant argues, in substance, that (1) Mathur in view of Muller does not disclose that the data is buffered accordingly if the first interface has a lower bandwidth than the second interface.

14. As to point (1) Applicant is incorrect. The data bus of Mathur is 256 bits wide, resulting in a bandwidth in excess of 3Gbytes/sec (col. 5, lines 35-40), whereas the Ethernet speeds routinely are at most 1Gbit/sec bandwidth (as is well known in the art). By this rationale, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

Again, it is the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in manner, which distinguishes over the prior art. As it is Applicant's right to continue to claim as broadly as possible their invention. It is also the Examiner's right to continue to interpret the claim language as broadly as possible. It is the Examiner's position that the detailed functionality (i.e. that the first interface is a WAN and the second interface communicates crossbar data, and that the embedded memory *only* buffers data from the first interface to the second interface, and that the external

Art Unit: 2143

memory *only* buffers data from the second interface to the first interface) that allows for Applicant's invention to overcome the prior art used in the rejection, fails to differentiate in detail how these features are unique. Thus, it is clear that Applicant must submit amendments to the claims in order to distinguish over the prior art use in the rejection that discloses different features of Applicant's claim invention.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (571) 272-3905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JEA
February 7, 2006



Wm. C. Vaughn, Jr.
WILLIAM C. VAUGHN, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER